



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/895,094	06/29/2001	Richard Dale Hoffman	AUS920010550US1	6699

7590 03/10/2005

Cynthia S. Byrd
International Business Machines
Intellectual Property Law
11400 Burnet Rd.
Austin, TX 78758

EXAMINER

TRAN, QUOC A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 03/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/895,094

Applicant(s)

HOFFMAN, RICHARD DALE

Examiner

Quoc A. Tran

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/08/2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 02/12/02&11/08/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to Amendment A, filed 11/8/2004.
2. Claims 1-16 are pending. Claims 1, 9, 10 and 14 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Schneider US Patent No. 6,338,082 B1 issued 01/08/2002 filed 03/15/2000 (hereinafter '082), in view of Nielsen US Patent No. US005892919A - filed 06/23/1997 (hereinafter '919).

In regard to dependent claim 1, "*upon receipt of the character string at the client*", as taught by '082 at col. 1, line 45 through col. 2, line 35 (i.e..... client computer may display or process it... A network resource identifier such as a Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) is a compact string of characters for identifying an abstract or physical resource...).

'082 does not explicitly teach, "*checking the character string for typing errors at the clients*", however as taught by '919 at col. 5, lines 60-67 (i.e.... user issues a network address for retrieval, that address is looked up in the spell check cache (500)...),

"and upon detection of a typing error, correcting the typing error at the client, without input from a user to produce a corrected URI character string", however as taught by '919 at col. 6, lines 15-20 (i.e..... spell check has been successful as shown in FIG. 8 (570)...the correct URL is issued (550) and the cache entry is updated as shown in FIG. 9 (555) ...). Examiner reads URL, which could interpreted as claimed "URI", specification page 4, lines 25-29.

"and upon producing the corrected URI character string, submitting the corrected URI character string", however as taught by '919 at col. 6, lines 15-20 (i.e.....the correct URL is issued (550) and the cache entry is updated as shown in FIG. 9 (555) ...). Examiner reads URL, which could interpreted as claimed "URI", specification page 4, lines 25-29.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified '919 into '082 to provide a way, wherein checking the character string for typing errors at the clients and upon detection of a typing error, correcting the typing error at the client, without input from a user to produce a corrected URI character string and upon producing the corrected URI character string, submitting the corrected URI character string. One of the ordinary skills in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to enhance

the efficiency of URL spell checking for errors , such as "http", "com", "org", "gif", "jpeg", that are not commonly known by users. URLs may also be in a foreign language, especially for users in non-English speaking countries. Additionally, the URL may include odd special characters such as .about, and @ that are difficult to type and hard to remember, as taught by '919 at col. 1, lines 40-62 (i.e... such as "http", "com", "org", "gif", "jpeg", that are not commonly known by users ...). Examiner reads URL, which could interpreted as claimed "URI", specification page 4, lines 25-29.

In regard to dependent claim 2, *"wherein the typing errors are selected from punctuation errors and..."*, as taught by '082 at col. 11, lines 17-33 (i.e..... Tests are then performed to determine how to process the received input 210. For instance, when it is determined in step 214 that input 210 has no "." delimiters or " " delimiters only, it becomes clear that there is no domain name or IP address...).

'082 does not explicitly teach, *"...and spelling errors"*, however as taught by '919 at col. 6, lines 15-20 (i.e..... spell check has been successful as shown in FIG. 8 (570)...).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a way, wherein checking the character string for typing errors at the clients and upon detection of a typing error. One of the ordinary skills in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to enhance the efficiency of URL spell checking for errors, such as "http", "com", "org", "gif", "jpeg", that are not commonly known by users. URLs may also be in a foreign language, especially for users in non-English speaking countries. Additionally, the URL may include odd special

characters such as .about. and @ that are difficult to type and hard to remember, as taught by '919 at col. 1, lines 40-62 (i.e... such as "http", "com", "org", "gif", "jpeg", that are not commonly known by users ...). Examiner reads URL, which could interpreted as claimed "URI", specification page 4, lines 25-29.

In regard to dependent claim 3, *"replacing the punctuation error with a correct punctuation mark"*, as taught by '082 at col. 11, lines 35-45 (i.e..... it is then further determined in step 234 whether input 210 includes a valid URI. If there is no valid URI, then a valid URI is generated in step 238 from input 210. For instance, if a scheme is missing, the web browser may add the prefix "http://" to the text or another scheme prefix...).

In regard to dependent claim 4, *"replacing the spelling error with a correct spelling"*, as taught by '082 at col. 6, lines 60-67 (i.e..... spell checked (310) and a list of potential URLs is generated (312). If the list is not empty (314) then the list of URLs is displayed to the user in a hypertext format (316) where the user can either select one of the URLs or cancel (318)...).

In regard to dependent claim 5, *"the typing errors are predefined"*, as taught by '082 at col. 11, lines 17-28 (i.e..... Tests are then performed to determine how to process the received input 210. For instance, when it is determined in step 214 that input 210 has no "." delimiters or " " delimiters only, it becomes clear that there is no domain name or IP address present... there is no domain name or IP address present and the input 210 is processed as a search request in step 218. Results, if any, are then notified, accessed, and/or displayed in step 222. When the presence of the "." delimiter

is determined in step 214, the input may include either an IP address or a domain name. When a domain name is parsed, the validity of the domain name is determined in step 226. Validity of URI syntax is explained in T. Berners-Lee, "Informational RFC (Request for Comment) 1630...).

In regard to dependent claim 6, "wherein the spelling errors are predefined", as taught by '680 at col. 7, lines 8-12 (i.e. If the selected URL is insufficient to retrieve a document (324) then, using the prior art, the "Document Not Found" error message is displayed (328), the invalid URL is removed from the list (330) and processing resumes at (314), continuing until a document is retrieved).

In regard to dependent claim 7, "wherein the punctuation errors are predefined", '082 at col. 11, lines 17-28 (i.e..... Tests are then performed to determine how to process the received input 210. For instance, when it is determined in step 214 that input 210 has no "." delimiters or " " delimiters only, it becomes clear that there is no domain name or IP address present... there is no domain name or IP address present and the input 210 is processed as a search request in step 218. Results, if any, are then notified, accessed, and/or displayed in step 222. When the presence of the "." delimiter is determined in step 214, the input may include either an IP address or a domain name. When a domain name is parsed, the validity of the domain name is determined in step 226. Validity of URI syntax is explained in T. Berners-Lee, "Informational RFC (Request for Comment) 1630...).

In regard to dependent claim 8, "connecting the IP client to an IP server", as taught by '082 at col. 1, line 45 through col. 2, line 35 (i.e..... transmission Control

Protocol/Internet Protocol (TCP/IP) connection that employs a standard Internet setup. A server computer may provide the data and a client computer may display or process it...),

'082 does not explicitly teach, "*identified by the corrected URI character string*", however as taught by '919 at col. 6, lines 15-20 (i.e....the correct URL is issued (550) and the cache entry is updated as shown in FIG. 9 (555) ...). Examiner reads URL, which could interpreted as claimed "URI", specification page 4, lines 25-29.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a way, wherein identified by the corrected URI character string to connecting the IP client to an IP server. One of the ordinary skills in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to enhance the efficiency of URL spell checking for errors, such as "http", "com", "org", "gif", "jpeg", that are not commonly known by users. URLs may also be in a foreign language, especially for users in non-English speaking countries. Additionally, the URL may include odd special characters such as. about, and @ that are difficult to type and hard to remember, as taught by '919 at col. 1, lines 40-62 (i.e... such as "http", "com", "org", "gif", "jpeg", that are not commonly known by users ... Examiner reads URL, which could interpreted as claimed "URI", specification page 4, lines 25-29.

In regard to independent claim 9, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1, and 8 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 10, is directed to a system for performing the method of claim 1, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 11, is directed to a system for performing the method of claim 2, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 12, is directed to a system for performing the method of claim 5, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 13, is directed to a system for performing the method of claim 8, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 14, is directed to a computer readable medium for performing the method of claim 1, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 15, is directed to a computer readable medium for performing the method of claim 3, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 16, is directed to a computer readable medium for performing the method of claim 5, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

Response to Argument

4. Examiner has completed a through study of Applicant's Amendments of 11/08/2004; especially, Applicant's amendments to claims 1, 8-10, 13-14 and remarks at pages 7-23.

5. As for amended claims 1, 8-10, 13-14 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Reponses to Remarks pages 7-8:

Applicant argues that, "*the Office has not established a prima facie case of Schneider and Nielsen*". The Office respectfully disagreed, for more detail sees the previous rejection and its motivation, which set forth in the rejection above.

Reponses to argument of amended independent claim1, Remarks pages 9-16:

The amended independent claim 1 has been fully considered but is moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

There for independent claim 1 remain rejected.

Reponses to argument claim 2, Remarks pages 16-17:

In regards to dependent claim 2, is necessitated by the rejection of the amended independent claim 1, therefor claim 2 are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as well.

Reponses to argument claim 3, Remarks pages 16-17:

Applicant argues that, Schneider did not teach, "*replacing the punctuation error with a correct punctuation mark*". The Office respectfully disagreed, the reason is set forth in the previous rejection. For more evident the following clearly instituted the claim limitation, as described by '919 at col. 1, line 40 through col. 2, line 8 (i.e.... In order to assist the user with URL spelling errors a spelling checker is needed. Spell checking in general is well established in the art, with numerous implementation schemes. The central idea of a spell checker is to take the word in question and compare it to a dictionary of spellings known to be correct to find one or more words that are spelled roughly the same way and to then provide the user the ability to chose the correct word

Art Unit: 2176

from a list presented by the spelling checking program... Caching of items that are frequently referenced is known. Various algorithms, including hashing, allow for the quick retrieval of an item stored in a cache). One of the ordinary skills in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to enhance the efficiency of URL spell checking for errors, such as "http", "com", "org", "gif", "jpeg", that are not commonly known by users. URLs may also be in a foreign language, especially for users in non-English speaking countries. Additionally, the URL may include odd special characters such as .about., , and @ that are difficult to type and hard to remember, as taught by '919 at col. 1, lines 40-62 (i.e... such as "http", "com", "org", "gif", "jpeg", that are not commonly known by users ...). Examiner reads URL, which could interpreted as claimed "URI", specification page 4, lines 25-29.

There for dependent claim 3 remain rejected.

Reponses to argument claim 4, Remarks pages 17-18:

Applicant argues that, Schneider did not teach, "*replacing the spelling error with a correct spelling*". The Office respectfully disagreed, the reason is set forth in the previous rejection. For more evident the following clearly instituted the claim limitation, as described by '919 at col. 1, line 40 thought col. 2, line 8 (i.e.... In order to assist the user with URL spelling errors a spelling checker is needed. Spell checking in general is well established in the art, with numerous implementation schemes. The central idea of a spell checker is to take the word in question and compare it to a dictionary of spellings known to be correct to find one or more words that are spelled roughly the same way and to then provide the user the ability to chose the correct word from a list presented

by the spelling checking program... Caching of items that are frequently referenced is known. Various algorithms, including hashing, allow for the quick retrieval of an item stored in a cache). One of the ordinary skills in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to enhance the efficiency of URL spell checking for errors, such as "http", "com", "org", "gif", "jpeg", that are not commonly known by users. URLs may also be in a foreign language, especially for users in non-English speaking countries. Additionally, the URL may include odd special characters such as .about., , and @ that are difficult to type and hard to remember, as taught by '919 at col. 1, lines 40-62 (i.e... such as "http", "com", "org", "gif", "jpeg", that are not commonly known by users ...). Examiner reads URL, which could interpreted as claimed "URI", specification page 4, lines 25-29.

There for dependent claim 4 remain rejected.

Reponses to argument claim 5, Remarks pages 18-19:

Applicant argues that, Schneider did not teach, "*the typing errors are predefined*". The Office respectfully disagreed, the reason is set forth in the previous rejection. For more evident the following clearly instituted the claim limitation, as described by '919 at col. 1, line 40 thought col. 2, line 8 (i.e.... In order to assist the user with URL spelling errors a spelling checker is needed. Spell checking in general is well established in the art, with numerous implementation schemes. The central idea of a spell checker is to take the word in question and compare it to a dictionary of spellings known to be correct to find one or more words that are spelled roughly the same way and to then provide the user the ability to chose the correct word from a list presented by the spelling checking

Art Unit: 2176

program... Caching of items that are frequently referenced is known. Various algorithms, including hashing, allow for the quick retrieval of an item stored in a cache). One of the ordinary skills in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to enhance the efficiency of URL spell checking for errors, such as "http", "com", "org", "gif", "jpeg", that are not commonly known by users. URLs may also be in a foreign language, especially for users in non-English speaking countries. Additionally, the URL may include odd special characters such as .about. and @ that are difficult to type and hard to remember, as taught by '919 at col. 1, lines 40-62 (i.e... such as "http", "com", "org", "gif", "jpeg", that are not commonly known by users ...). Examiner reads URL, which could interpreted as claimed "URI", specification page 4, lines 25-29.

There for dependent claim 5 remain rejected.

Reponses to argument claim 6, Remarks page 19:

Applicant argues that, Schneider did not teach, "*the spelling errors are predefined*". The Office respectfully disagreed, the reason is set forth in the previous rejection. For more evident the following clearly instituted the claim limitation, as described by '919 at col. 1, line 40 through col. 2, line 8 (i.e.... In order to assist the user with URL spelling errors a spelling checker is needed. Spell checking in general is well established in the art, with numerous implementation schemes. The central idea of a spell checker is to take the word in question and compare it to a dictionary of spellings known to be correct to find one or more words that are spelled roughly the same way and to then provide the user the ability to chose the correct word from a list presented by the spelling checking program... Caching of items that are frequently referenced is

known. Various algorithms, including hashing, allow for the quick retrieval of an item stored in a cache). One of the ordinary skills in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to enhance the efficiency of URL spell checking for errors, such as "http", "com", "org", "gif", "jpeg", that are not commonly known by users. URLs may also be in a foreign language, especially for users in non-English speaking countries. Additionally, the URL may include odd special characters such as .about, and @ that are difficult to type and hard to remember, as taught by '919 at col. 1, lines 40-62 (i.e... such as "http", "com", "org", "gif", "jpeg", that are not commonly known by users ...). Examiner reads URL, which could interpreted as claimed "URI", specification page 4, lines 25-29.

There for dependent claim 6 remain rejected.

Reponses to argument claim 7, Remarks pages 19-20:

Applicant argues that, Schneider did not teach, "*the punctuation errors are predefined*". The Office respectfully disagreed, the reason is set forth in the previous rejection. For more evident the following clearly instituted the claim limitation, as described by '919 at col. 1, line 40 through col. 2, line 8 (i.e.... In order to assist the user with URL spelling errors a spelling checker is needed. Spell checking in general is well established in the art, with numerous implementation schemes. The central idea of a spell checker is to take the word in question and compare it to a dictionary of spellings known to be correct to find one or more words that are spelled roughly the same way and to then provide the user the ability to chose the correct word from a list presented by the spelling checking program... Caching of items that are frequently referenced is

known. Various algorithms, including hashing, allow for the quick retrieval of an item stored in a cache). One of the ordinary skills in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to enhance the efficiency of URL spell checking for errors, such as "http", "com", "org", "gif", "jpeg", that are not commonly known by users. URLs may also be in a foreign language, especially for users in non-English speaking countries. Additionally, the URL may include odd special characters such as. about, , and @ that are difficult to type and hard to remember, as taught by '919 at col. 1, lines 40-62 (i.e... such as "http", "com", "org", "gif", "jpeg", that are not commonly known by users ...). Examiner reads URL, which could interpreted as claimed "URI", specification page 4, lines 25-29.

There for dependent claim 7 remain rejected.

Reponses to argument of amended dependent claim8, Remarks page 20:

The amended dependent claim 8 has been fully considered but is moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

There for dependent claim 8 remain rejected.

Reponses to argument claims 9-16, Remarks pages 20-23:

Applicant argues that claims 9-16 should be allowed. The Office respectfully disagrees, caused by for the rejection of claims 1-3, 5 and 8; the reason is set forth in the response above, which lead to the rejection of the intervening claims.

Therefor the claims 9-16 remain rejected.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quoc A. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-4103. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>.

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Quoc A. Tran
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2176
March 4, 2005